arXiv:1304.2323v1 [math.LO] 8 Apr 2013

AD AND JÓNSSON CARDINALS IN $L(\mathbb{R})$

S. JACKSON, R. KETCHERSID, F. SCHLUTZENBERG, AND W. H. WOODIN

ABSTRACT. Assume $\mathsf{ZF} + \mathsf{AD} + V = L(\mathbb{R})$ and let $\kappa < \Theta$ be an uncountable cardinal. We show that κ is Jónsson, and that if $\mathrm{cof}(\kappa) = \omega$ then κ is Rowbottom. We also establish some other partition properties.

1. INTRODUCTION

Assume $\mathsf{AD} + V = L(\mathbb{R})$ and let $\kappa < \Theta$ be an uncountable cardinal. We will show that κ is Jónsson. We also show that if $\mathrm{cof}(\kappa) = \omega$ then κ is Rowbottom. If κ is regular then by Steel's result, κ is measurable and so Rowbottom (see [3, 8.27]). So κ is Rowbottom iff $\mathrm{cof}(\kappa) \in \{\omega, \kappa\}$. However, we also show that irrespective of its cofinality, κ satisfies a partition property generalizing Rowbottomness, and also satisfies another partition property, superficially stronger than Jónssonness.

The history of these results are as follows. Kleinberg showed by pure determinacy arguments that all (uncountable cardinals) $\kappa < \aleph_\omega$ are Jónsson and that $\aleph_\omega$ is Rowbottom (see [1]). Jackson, extending some work joint with B. Löwe, showed, also by determinacy arguments, that all $\kappa < \aleph_{\omega_1}$ are Jónsson, and any $\kappa < \aleph_{\omega_1}$ of cofinality ω is Rowbottom. Woodin then announced the result that all $\kappa < \Theta$ are Jónsson, and that this could be shown using the directed system analysis of HOD. Later, motivated by Woodin's announcement, Jackson, Ketchersid and Schlutzenberg independently proved the same result in joint work, along with the Rowbottom and other partition results, also through the directed system analysis. The proof depends on Lemma 2.7, though only makes direct use of the weaker Corollary 2.8. Our original argument established this corollary directly. Schlutzenberg proved the stronger Lemma 2.7, and we included this as it may be of independent interest.

Woodin has in fact proved that assuming $\mathsf{ZF} + \mathsf{AD}^+$, every uncountable cardinal $\kappa < \Theta$ is Jónsson. Here we limit ourselves to assuming $V = L(\mathbb{R})$.

Let κ be an uncountable cardinal. Recall that κ is *Jónsson* iff for every $F\colon \kappa^{<\omega} \to \kappa$ there is an $A \subseteq \kappa$ with $|A| = \kappa$ such that $F``A^{<\omega} \neq$

κ. Recall that κ is *Rowbottom* iff for every $F\colon \kappa^{<\omega} \to \lambda < \kappa$, there is an $A \subseteq \kappa$ with $|A| = \kappa$ such that $|F``A^{<\omega}| \leq \omega$.

We also use the following partition terminology. Let κ, γ be infinite cardinals and δ an ordinal. We write $\kappa \to [\gamma]^{<\omega}_{\delta}$ iff for every function $F\colon \kappa^{<\omega} \to \delta$, there is $A \subseteq \kappa$, such that A has ordertype κ, and $|F``A^{<\omega}| \leq \gamma$. We write $\kappa \to [\gamma]^{<\omega}_{<\delta}$ iff $\kappa \to [\gamma]^{<\omega}_{\lambda}$ for each $\lambda < \delta$.

2. Main Results

We now state our main results.

2.1. **Theorem.** *Assume* $\mathsf{AD} + V = L(\mathbb{R})$. *Let* $\kappa < \Theta$ *be an uncountable cardinal. Then:*

(a) *If* $\mathrm{cof}(\kappa) = \omega$ *then* κ *is Rowbottom.*
(b) *In fact, in general,* $\kappa \to [\mathrm{cof}(\kappa)]^{<\omega}_{<\kappa}$ *and* $\kappa \to [\omega]^{<\omega}_{<\mathrm{cof}(\kappa)}$.
(c) κ *is Jónsson.*
(d) *In fact, let* λ *be a cardinal such that* $\omega_1 \leq \lambda \leq \kappa$. *Let* $F\colon \kappa^{<\omega} \to \lambda$. *Then there is* $A \subseteq \kappa$ *of ordertype* κ *such that* $|\lambda \backslash F``A^{<\omega}| = \lambda$, *and such that if* $\lambda = \mathrm{cof}(\kappa)$ *then* $F``A^{<\omega}$ *is non-stationary.*

As a corollary to the proof of Theorem 2.1, we obtain a simultaneous partition property:

2.2. **Theorem.** *Assume* $\mathsf{AD} + V = L(\mathbb{R})$. *Let* $\kappa < \Theta$ *be an uncountable cardinal,* $\gamma_1, \lambda_1 < \kappa$ *and* $\gamma_2, \lambda_2 < \mathrm{cof}(\kappa)$. *For each* $i \in \{1, 2\}$, *let* $\langle F^i_\alpha \rangle_{\alpha < \gamma_i}$ *be such that* $F^i_\alpha\colon \kappa^{<\omega} \to \lambda_i$ *for each* $\alpha < \gamma_i$. *Then there is* $A \subseteq \kappa$ *such that* $|A| = \kappa$ *and for all* $\alpha < \gamma_1$, $|F^1_\alpha``A^{<\omega}| \leq \mathrm{cof}(\kappa)$ *and for all* $\alpha < \gamma_2$, $|F^2_\alpha``A^{<\omega}| \leq \omega$.

By a standard argument, Theorem 2.2 easily implies the following "two-cardinal" result.

2.3. **Corollary.** *Assume* $\mathsf{AD} + V = L(\mathbb{R})$. *Let* $\kappa < \Theta$ *be a cardinal, and suppose* $\omega \leq \lambda_1 < \mathrm{cof}(\kappa) \leq \lambda_2 < \kappa$. *Then* $(\kappa, \lambda_2, \lambda_1) \to (\kappa, \mathrm{cof}(\kappa), \omega)$. *That is, for any first order structure* $M = (\kappa, \vec{R}, \lambda_2, \lambda_1)$, *i.e. with universe* κ, *countably many predicates* $\vec{R}$, *and one-place predicates* λ_1, λ_2, *there is* $X \prec M$, *with* X *having universe* $A \subseteq \kappa$ *with* $|A| = \kappa$, *and* $|A \cap \lambda_2| \leq \mathrm{cof}(\kappa)$, *and* $|A \cap \lambda_1| \leq \omega$.

Proof. Let $G\colon \kappa^{<\omega} \to \kappa$ be a Skolem function for M. (Take G such that whenever $B \subseteq \kappa$ has limit ordertype, then $G``B^{<\omega} \prec M$.) Let $F_i\colon \kappa^{<\omega} \to \lambda_i + 1$ be defined by $F_i(b) = \min(G(b), \lambda_i)$. If $A \subseteq \kappa$ witnesses Theorem 2.2 with respect to F_1, F_2 then A is as required. $\square$

2.4. **Remark.** The partition properties in Theorem 2.1 are optimal in certain ways. The property $\kappa \to [\lambda]^1_\kappa$ is false for any $\lambda < \kappa$ (consider the identity function). The property $\kappa \to [\lambda]^1_{\mathrm{cof}(\kappa)}$ is false for any $\lambda < \mathrm{cof}(\kappa)$. (Let $\langle\gamma_\alpha\rangle_{\alpha<\mathrm{cof}(\kappa)}$ be a κ-cofinal sequence $\subseteq \kappa$. Let $F : \kappa \to \mathrm{cof}(\kappa)$ be such that $F(\beta)$ is the least α such that $\gamma_\alpha > \beta$. Then whenever $A \subseteq \kappa$ is cofinal in κ, we have $|F``A| = \mathrm{cof}(\kappa)$.)

In Theorem 2.2, if κ is singular, the requirement that the F^1_α's be uniformly bounded by λ_1 is necessary. For let $\langle\gamma_\alpha\rangle_{\alpha<\mathrm{cof}(\kappa)}$ be κ-cofinal and let $F_\alpha\colon \kappa \to \kappa$ be given by $F_\alpha(\beta) = \beta$ for $\beta < \gamma_\alpha$, and $F_\alpha(\beta) = 0$ otherwise. Then there is no A as in Theorem 2.2 for this sequence.

Before we start the proofs, we mention a couple of related questions:

2.5. **Question.** Assume $\mathsf{AD} + V = L(\mathbb{R})$. Do the partition properties of 2.1 hold for any $\kappa \geq \Theta$? Are there non-ordinal Jónsson cardinals? In particular, is $\mathbb{R}$ Jónsson?

Ralf Schindler suggested the following question.

2.6. **Question.** What is the consistency strength of $\mathsf{ZF}+$"Every uncountable cardinal κ (or $\kappa < \Theta$) is Jónsson"?

The proof of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 proceed through a few lemmas. We first use the directed system analysis of $\mathrm{HOD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$ to prove 2.7. Its proof is related to the proof of Steel's result [3, 8.27], that if κ is regular and uncountable, then it is measurable (under the same hypotheses).

2.7. **Lemma.** *Assume* $\mathsf{AD} + V = L(\mathbb{R})$. *Let* $\kappa < \Theta$ *be a cardinal such that* $\omega_1 < \kappa$, *and let* $x \in \mathbb{R}$. *Then* $\mathrm{HOD}_x \models$*"there are* κ*-many measurables* $< \kappa$*".*

2.8. **Corollary.** *Adopt the assumptions of Lemma 2.7 other than "*$\kappa > \omega_1$*"; assume* $\kappa > \omega$. *Then* $\mathrm{HOD}_x \models$ *"either* κ *is measurable or is a limit of measurables".*

Working in ZFC, we then prove in Lemma 2.12, some partition properties for κ such that κ is either measurable or a limit of measurables. We then prove the main theorems by passing from $L(\mathbb{R})$ into some $\mathrm{HOD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}_x$, applying Lemma 2.12 there.

We will deal in general with non-normal, fine iteration trees on premice, so as to give Lemma 2.11 more generally. However, for the purposes of proving Theorem 2.1 it suffices to deal only with normal iteration trees, so the reader might prefer to restrict to this case. We take *iteration tree* to be defined as in [2, §5], except that we drop condition (3) (i.e. "$\alpha < \beta \implies \mathrm{lh}(E_\alpha) < \mathrm{lh}(E_\beta)$"), and strengthen the first clause of condition (4), so as to read "if $\mathcal{T}-\mathrm{pred}(\alpha + 1) = \beta$ then $\kappa = \mathrm{crit}(E_\alpha) < \rho_\gamma$ for each $\gamma \in [\beta, \alpha)$" (here ρ_γ refers to $\nu(E_\gamma)$). Any tree satisfying all requirements of [2] (including (3)), in fact satisfies the strengthening of the first clause of (4) above.

Given a structure $\mathcal{N}$ and $\mu \in \mathrm{OR}^{\mathcal{N}}$, if μ is the largest cardinal of $\mathcal{N}$ then $(\mu^+)^{\mathcal{N}}$ denotes $\mathrm{OR}^{\mathcal{N}}$.

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be an iteration tree and for $\alpha < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$ let $M_\alpha = M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$, $E_\alpha = E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$, etc. Let $\delta + 1 < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$ and $\beta = \mathcal{T}\text{−pred}(\delta+1)$. If $\mathcal{T}$ is not normal then $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\delta$ might not be close to $\mathcal{M}^*_{\delta+1}$, but we still have preservation of the degree n fine structure between $\mathcal{M}^*_{\delta+1}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{T}}_{\delta+1}$, where $n = \deg^{\mathcal{T}}(\delta+1)$, by e.g. [2, 4.3,4.4]. For instance, $i^*_{\beta,\delta+1}(p_n^{\mathcal{M}^*_{\delta+1}}) = p_n^{\mathcal{M}_{\delta+1}}$.

$(*1)$ Let $\mathcal{T}, \delta, \beta$ be as above and $\mu = \mathrm{crit}(E_\delta)$. Let $\gamma \in [\beta, \delta)$ be such that $\mathrm{lh}(E_\gamma)$ is minimal. Then (a) $(\mu^+)^{\mathcal{M}^*_{\delta+1}} \leq \mathrm{lh}(E_\epsilon)$ for each $\epsilon \in [\beta, \delta)$. In fact, (b) for each $\epsilon \in [\beta, \gamma]$, E_γ is on $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{M}_\epsilon} \frown F^{\mathcal{M}_\epsilon}$; and for each $\epsilon \in (\gamma, \delta]$, $\mathrm{lh}(E_\gamma)$ is a cardinal of $\mathcal{M}_\epsilon$ and $M_\epsilon||\mathrm{lh}(E_\gamma) = M_\beta||\mathrm{lh}(E_\gamma)$; and if $\gamma' \in [\beta, \delta)$ and $\mathrm{lh}(E_{\gamma'}) = \mathrm{lh}(E_\gamma)$ then $\gamma = \gamma'$. For (b) follows by induction through $[\beta, \delta]$, using coherence, etc. Then (a) follows from (b) since E_δ must measure exactly $\mathcal{P}(\mu) \cap M^*_{\delta+1}$. Moreover, (c) suppose $(\mu^+)^{\mathcal{M}^*_{\delta+1}} = \mathrm{lh}(E_\gamma)$; then $M^*_{\delta+1} = M_\beta|\mathrm{lh}(E_\gamma)$, so μ is the largest cardinal of $\mathcal{M}^*_{\delta+1}$ (recall that $M_\gamma|\mathrm{lh}(E_\gamma)$ projects strictly below $\mathrm{lh}(E_\gamma)$), E_γ is type 2 (since $\mu < \nu(E_\gamma)$), and if also $\mathcal{T}$ does not drop in model at $\delta + 1$ then $\beta = \gamma$.

Given a premouse $\mathcal{M}$ and $\kappa \in \mathrm{OR}^{\mathcal{M}}$, say κ is *finely measurable* (*fm*) *in* $\mathcal{M}$ iff there is E on $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{M}} \frown F^{\mathcal{M}}$ such that $\mathrm{crit}(E) = \kappa$ and E is total over $\mathcal{M}$. Let us say that κ is *almost finely measurable* (*afm*) *in* $\mathcal{M}$ if κ is fm in $\mathcal{M}$ or if $\mathcal{M}$ is active type 2 and κ is fm in $\mathrm{Ult}_0(\mathcal{M}, F^{\mathcal{M}})$.

Let us make some observations on this definition.

$(*2)$ Let $\kappa < \mathrm{OR}^{\mathcal{M}}$. (a) If κ is fm in M then $(\kappa^+)^{\mathcal{M}} < \mathrm{OR}^{\mathcal{M}}$. (b) If $\mathcal{M}$ is active and κ is fm in $U = \mathrm{Ult}_0(\mathcal{M}, F^{\mathcal{M}})$ and $(\kappa^+)^{\mathcal{M}} < \mathrm{OR}^{\mathcal{M}}$ then κ is fm in $\mathcal{M}$.

For $(*2)$, (a) is because if $\mathcal{N}$ is active and $\kappa = \mathrm{crit}(F^{\mathcal{N}})$ then $(\kappa^+)^{\mathcal{N}} < \mathrm{OR}^{\mathcal{N}}$. For (b), let E witness the fine measurability of κ in U, and let G be the normal measure segment of E. So G is on $\mathbb{E}^U \frown F^U$, but $(\kappa^+)^{\mathcal{M}} < \mathrm{OR}^{\mathcal{M}}$, $\mathrm{OR}^{\mathcal{M}}$ is a cardinal of U and $\mathcal{M}||\mathrm{OR}^{\mathcal{M}} = U||\mathrm{OR}^{\mathcal{M}}$, which implies $\mathrm{lh}(G) < \mathrm{OR}^{\mathcal{M}}$ and that G is on $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{M}}$, giving (b).

$(*3)$ Let $\mathcal{T}, \delta, \beta, \mu$ be as in $(*1)$ and assume that $\mathcal{T}$ does not drop in model at $\delta + 1$. Then μ is afm in $\mathcal{M}_\beta$.

For $(*3)$: If $\beta = \delta$ the statement is trivial; assume $\beta < \delta$. Let G be the normal measure segment of E_δ. We will show that G witnesses the afm of μ in $\mathcal{M}_\beta$. We have $\mathcal{M}^*_{\delta+1} = \mathcal{M}_\beta$. Let γ be as in $(*1)$. By $(*1)$(a), $(\mu^+)^{\mathcal{M}_\beta} \leq \mathrm{lh}(E_\gamma)$. Suppose first that $(\mu^+)^{\mathcal{M}_\beta}$ exists in $\mathcal{M}_\beta$. Using $(*1)$(c),(b), we get that $(\mu^+)^{\mathcal{M}_\beta} < \mathrm{lh}(E_\gamma)$ and both are cardinals in $\mathcal{M}_\delta$, so since G is type 1 and G is $\mathcal{M}_\beta$-total, $(\mu^+)^{\mathcal{M}_\beta} < \mathrm{lh}(G) < \mathrm{lh}(E_\gamma)$, so

G is on $\mathcal{M}_\beta$, and μ is afm there. Now suppose μ is the largest cardinal of $\mathcal{M}_\beta$. Then by $(*1)$(a),(c), we have $E_\beta = F^{\mathcal{M}_\beta}$ and $\gamma = \beta$. Like in the previous case, then G is on $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{M}_{\beta+1}}$, and the agreement between $\mathcal{M}_{\beta+1}$ and U gives that G is on $\mathbb{E}^U$.

$(*4)$ Let $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}$ be premice, $\pi : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{N}$ be Σ_1-elementary, and $\tau \in \mathrm{OR}^{\mathcal{M}}$ such that if τ is the largest cardinal of $\mathcal{M}$ then $\pi(\tau)$ is likewise in $\mathcal{N}$. Then τ is almost finely measurable in $\mathcal{M}$ iff $\pi(\tau)$ is almost finely measurable in $\mathcal{N}$.

For $(*4)$, first assume that $(\tau^+)^{\mathcal{M}}$ exists in $\mathcal{M}$. By Σ_1-elementarity, $\pi((\tau^+)^{\mathcal{M}}) = (\pi(\tau)^+)^{\mathcal{N}}$. So by $(*2)$ we need only consider fine measurability in $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}$. But τ is fm in $\mathcal{M}$ iff there is E on $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{M}} \frown F^{\mathcal{M}}$ such that $\mathrm{crit}(E) = \tau$ and $(\tau^+)^{\mathcal{M}} < \mathrm{lh}(E)$; this is Σ_1 in the parameter $(\tau^+)^{\mathcal{M}}$, so $\pi(\tau)$ is fm in $\mathcal{N}$, as required. Now suppose that τ is the largest cardinal of $\mathcal{M}$, so $\pi(\tau)$ is the largest cardinal of $\mathcal{N}$. So assume $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}$ are type 2 and consider fine measurability in $U^{\mathcal{M}} = \mathrm{Ult}_0(\mathcal{M}, F^{\mathcal{M}})$ and $U^{\mathcal{N}} = \mathrm{Ult}_0(\mathcal{N}, F^{\mathcal{N}})$. Let $\psi : U^{\mathcal{M}} \to U^{\mathcal{N}}$ be given by π and the shift lemma. Then ψ is Σ_1-elementary and $\psi(\tau) = \pi(\tau)$, so the statement reduces to the previous case. (If $U^{\mathcal{M}}, U^{\mathcal{N}}$ are not wellfounded then the previous case doesn't literally apply, but the first order properties of $U^{\mathcal{M}}, U^{\mathcal{N}}, \psi$ are sufficient.)

2.9. **Definition.** Let $\pi : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{N}$ be Σ_1-elementary between premice and $\gamma \in \mathrm{OR}^{\mathcal{N}}$, such that $\gamma < \sup \pi``\mathrm{OR}^{\mathcal{M}}$.

We say γ is a *generator* (relative to π) iff $\gamma \neq \pi(f)(a)$ for any $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and $a \in \gamma^{<\omega}$.

We say that $\mathcal{N}$ has the *hull property at* γ (relative to π) iff $\mathcal{P}(\gamma)^{\mathcal{N}} \subseteq H$, where H is the transitive collapse of $\mathrm{Hull}_0^{\mathcal{N}}(\gamma \cup \pi``\mathcal{M})$.

$(*5)$ Let $\pi : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{N}$ be Σ_1-elementary and $\gamma \in \mathrm{OR}^{\mathcal{N}}$. If $\pi(\beta) > \gamma$, then γ is a generator iff $\gamma \neq \pi(f)(a)$ for any $f \colon \beta^{<\omega} \to \beta$ and $a \in \gamma^{<\omega}$. Suppose also $\sigma \colon \mathcal{N} \to \mathcal{Q}$ is Σ_1-elementary. Note that γ is a generator for π iff $\sigma(\gamma)$ is a generator for $\sigma \circ \pi$. For given $f \in \mathcal{M}$, and $\gamma \notin \pi(f)``\gamma^{<\omega}$, then this lifts under σ, and vice versa. Note also that $\mathcal{N}$ has the hull property at γ iff for every $A \in \mathcal{P}(\gamma)^{\mathcal{N}}$, there is $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and $a \in \gamma^{<\omega}$ such that $\pi(f)(a) \cap \gamma = A$. If $\mathcal{N}$ has the hull property at γ, and H is the transitive collapse of $\mathrm{Hull}_0(\gamma \cup \pi``\mathcal{M})$, then $H||(\gamma^+)^H = \mathcal{N}||(\gamma^+)^{\mathcal{N}}$; this follows by condensation. (However, it can happen that $H|(\gamma^+)^H \neq \mathcal{N}|(\gamma^+)^{\mathcal{N}}$. For example, suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is type 2, γ is the largest cardinal of $\mathcal{M}$ and γ is afm in $\mathcal{M}$. Let $E \in \mathrm{Ult}_0(\mathcal{M}, F^{\mathcal{M}})$ witness the latter. Let $\mathcal{N} = \mathrm{Ult}_0(\mathcal{M}, E)$ and let $\pi = i_E^{\mathcal{M}}$. Then $\mathcal{N}$ has the hull property at γ and $H = \mathcal{M}$, so H is active at $(\gamma^+)^H = (\gamma^+)^{\mathcal{N}}$, but $\mathcal{N}$ is passive there.)

2.10. **Remark.** The following lemma applies to iteration trees which aren't necessarily normal. However, for our present purposes, one may assume that $\mathcal{T}$ is a finite stack of normal trees $\mathcal{T}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_{k-1}$, and that η, ξ are both indices of $\mathcal{T}_{k-1}$.

2.11. **Lemma.** *Let* $\mathcal{M}$ *be a fine-structural premouse,* $\mathcal{T}$ *an iteration tree on* $\mathcal{M}$*,* $\xi < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$*,* $n = \deg^{\mathcal{T}}(\xi)$*. Let* $\chi \in [0, \xi]_{\mathcal{T}}$ *be such that* $(\chi, \xi]_{\mathcal{T}}$ *has no drops in model or degree. Let* $\eta \in [\chi, \xi]_{\mathcal{T}}$*.*

Let $\kappa \leq \rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\xi}$ *be in the range of* $i^{\mathcal{T}}_{\eta,\xi}$*. Let* λ *be the sup of all* $\gamma < \kappa$ *such that* γ *is almost finely measurable in* $\mathcal{M}_\xi$*. It follows that* $\lambda \in \mathrm{rg}(i^{\mathcal{T}}_{\eta,\xi})$ *(to be established).*

For $\alpha \in [\eta, \xi]_{\mathcal{T}}$*, let* $i^{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha,\xi}((\kappa_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha)) = (\kappa, \lambda)$ *and let* G_α *be the set of* $i_{\chi,\alpha}$*-generators in the interval* $[\lambda_\alpha, \kappa_\alpha]$*.*

If $\kappa < \rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\xi}$*, suppose that* $\mathcal{M}_\eta$ *has the hull property at every point in* $[\lambda_\eta, \kappa_\eta]$*, relative to* $i_{\chi,\eta}$*. Then we have*

(1)$_\xi$*:* $\mathcal{M}_\xi$ *has the hull property at every point in* $[\lambda_\xi, \kappa_\xi]$ *relative to* $i_{\chi,\xi}$*, and for each* $\alpha \in [\eta, \xi]_{\mathcal{T}}$*, we have* $i^{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha,\xi}``G_\alpha = G_\xi \cap (\{\kappa_\xi\} \cup \sup i_{\alpha,\xi}``\kappa_\alpha)$*. If* κ *is afm in* $\mathcal{M}_\xi$ *then* $\{\kappa_\xi\} \cup G_\xi \backslash \sup i_{\eta,\xi}``\kappa_\eta$ *is a closed set of inaccessibles of* $\mathcal{M}_\xi$*. If* $\kappa$ *is not afm in* $\mathcal{M}_\xi$ *then* $G_\xi = i_{\eta,\xi}``G_\eta$*.*

If $\kappa = \rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\xi}$ *then*

(2)$_\xi$*: (a)* $G_\xi = \emptyset$ *or* $G_\xi = \{\kappa_\xi\}$*, and moreover,* $i_{\eta,\xi}``G_\eta = G_\xi$*. We also have (b)*

$$\mathcal{M}_\xi | \rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\xi} \subseteq \mathrm{Hull}_0^{\mathcal{M}_\xi}(\lambda_\xi \cup i_{\chi,\xi}``(\mathcal{M}_\chi || \rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\chi})).$$

Proof.

Claim 1. For $\alpha \in [\eta, \xi]_{\mathcal{T}}$, let λ'_α be the sup of all afm's γ of $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ such that $\gamma < \kappa_\alpha$. Then $i_{\alpha,\xi}(\lambda'_\alpha) = \lambda = \lambda_\xi$. In particular, $\lambda_\xi \in \mathrm{rg}(i_{\alpha,\xi})$, and $\lambda_\alpha = \lambda'_\alpha$.

If $\lambda < \kappa = \rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\xi}$ then also $\lambda \in \mathrm{rg}(i_{\chi,\xi})$.

Proof. Note that if γ is afm in $\mathcal{M}$, then γ is a limit cardinal of $\mathcal{M}$.

Let θ_α be the largest limit cardinal θ of $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ such that $\theta \leq \kappa_\alpha$. So $\theta_\xi = i_{\alpha,\xi}(\theta_\alpha)$ is likewise with respect to $\mathcal{M}_\xi$ and κ_ξ, and $\lambda'_\alpha \leq \theta_\alpha$ and $\lambda'_\xi \leq \theta_\xi$.

By $(*4)$, θ_α is afm in $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ iff θ_ξ is afm is $\mathcal{M}_\xi$. Moreover, let $\beta = \alpha$ or $\beta = \xi$. Given $\gamma < \theta_\beta$, γ is afm in $\mathcal{M}_\beta$ iff γ is afm in $\mathcal{M}_\beta | \theta_\beta$ (by the initial segment condition and that θ_β is a limit cardinal of $\mathcal{M}_\beta$). Therefore λ'_β is definable over $\mathcal{M}_\beta | \theta_\beta$ (possibly $\lambda'_\beta = \theta_\beta$), uniformly in β.

It follows that $i_{\alpha,\xi}(\lambda'_\alpha) = \lambda'_\xi = \lambda_\xi$, as required.

Finally, if $\kappa = \rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\xi}$ and $\lambda < \kappa$, then the fact that $i_{\chi,\xi}$"$\rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\chi}$ is cofinal in $\rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\xi}$, and the arguments above, show that $\lambda \in \mathrm{rg}(i_{\chi,\xi})$. $\square$

Suppose now that $\kappa < \rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\xi}$. We proceed by induction on $\alpha \in [\eta, \xi]_{\mathcal{T}}$ to prove $(1)_\alpha$. The statement $(1)_\eta$ is trivial.

We focus on the case that $\alpha = \delta + 1 > \eta$ for some δ. Let $\beta = \mathcal{T}{-}\mathrm{pred}(\alpha)$. By induction, $(1)_\beta$ holds. Let $\mu = \mathrm{crit}(E_\delta)$, so $\mu < \rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\beta}$. By $(*3)$ either $\mu \leq \lambda_\beta$ or $\kappa_\beta \leq \mu$.

Case 1. $\kappa_\beta < \mu$.

Then $(1)_\alpha$ follows from $(1)_\beta$ and the Σ_0-elementarity of $i_{\beta,\alpha}$.

Case 2. $\mu \leq \kappa_\beta$.

Fix $\gamma \in [\lambda_\alpha, \kappa_\alpha]$. We first establish that the hull property holds at γ for $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$. If $\gamma < \mu$ then this is as in Case 1 so assume $\mu \leq \gamma$. Let $\gamma^* \in \mathcal{M}_\beta$ be least such that $i_{\beta,\alpha}(\gamma^*) \geq \gamma$. So $\mu \leq \gamma^* \in [\lambda_\beta, \kappa_\beta]$, and by $(1)_\beta$, $\mathcal{M}_\beta$ has the hull property at γ^*. If $\mu = \gamma$ then $\mu = \gamma^*$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mu)^{\mathcal{M}_\beta} = \mathcal{P}(\mu)^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha}$, and the hull property of $\mathcal{M}_\beta$ at μ then implies it of $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ at μ. So assume $\mu < \gamma$.

Every $A \in \mathcal{P}(\gamma)^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha}$ is of the form $A = [a, f]^{\mathcal{M}_\beta}_{E_\delta}$, for some $a \in \nu(E_\delta)^{<\omega}$ and $f\colon \mu^{|a|} \to \mathcal{P}(\gamma^*)^{\mathcal{M}_\beta}$ such that f is given by a generalized $r\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n$ term over $\mathcal{M}_\beta$. In fact, $f \in \mathcal{M}_\beta$. For $\gamma^*, \mu \leq \kappa_\beta < \rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\beta}$, so f is coded by a bounded subset of $\rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\beta}$ which is generalized $r\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n$ over $\mathcal{M}_\beta$. If $\rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\beta} > (\kappa_\beta^+)^{\mathcal{M}_\beta}$ this is clear, and if $\rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\beta} = (\kappa_\beta^+)^{\mathcal{M}_\beta}$, it is because there is $\gamma < \rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\beta}$ such that $\mathrm{ran}(f) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_\beta|\gamma$; for if f is unbounded then certainly $n \geq 1$, and as in [2, p.66] one can then use f to give a generalized $r\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n$ definition of a subset W of κ_β giving a wellorder of length $(\kappa_\beta^+)^{\mathcal{M}_\beta}$, but then $W \in \mathcal{M}_\beta$, contradiction.

So in fact $f \in \mathcal{M}_\beta$ and $A = i_{\beta,\alpha}(f)(a)$. By the hull property at γ^* there is $f' \in \mathcal{M}_\beta$ such that

$$f' \in \mathrm{Hull}_0^{\mathcal{M}_\beta}(\gamma^* \cup i_{\chi,\beta}\text{``}\mathcal{M}_\chi)$$

and such that $f'(b) \cap \gamma^* = f(b)$ for all $b \in \mu^{<\omega}$. Therefore letting $A' = i_{\beta,\alpha}(f')(a)$, we have $A' \cap \gamma = A$, and

$$A' \in \mathrm{Hull}_0^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha}(a \cup i_{\beta,\alpha}\text{``}\gamma^* \cup i_{\chi,\alpha}\text{``}\mathcal{M}_\chi).$$

Now $i_{\beta,\alpha}$"$\gamma^* \subseteq \gamma$ (by choice of γ^*). Let us see that we may assume $a \subseteq \gamma$, giving

$$A' \in \mathrm{Hull}_0^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha}(\gamma \cup i_{\chi,\alpha}\text{``}\mathcal{M}_\chi),$$

completing the proof of the hull property at γ.

Well, $a \subseteq \nu(E_\delta) < i_{\beta,\alpha}(\mu)$. If $\mu < \gamma^*$ then this gives $a \subseteq \gamma$. Otherwise $\mu = \gamma^*$. Since $\gamma^* \in [\lambda_\beta, \kappa_\beta]$ and μ is afm in $\mathcal{M}_\beta$, we therefore have $\mu = \lambda_\beta$ or $\mu = \kappa_\beta$. If $\mu = \lambda_\beta$ then $\gamma = \lambda_\alpha$ (since $\gamma \geq \lambda_\alpha$ and $\gamma \leq i_{\beta,\alpha}(\gamma^*)$), and therefore again $a \subseteq \gamma$. So suppose $\lambda_\beta < \mu = \kappa_\beta$. So κ_β is a successor afm of $\mathcal{M}_\beta$. Therefore E_δ is an order 0 measure, and we may take $a = \{\kappa_\beta\}$. But $\gamma > \mu = \kappa_\beta$, so again $a \subseteq \gamma$, as required.

Next we examine the generators G_α.

Subcase 1. *$\mu \leq \lambda_\beta$.*

We claim that (†1) $G_\alpha = i_{\beta,\alpha}``G_\beta$.

By ($*$5), $i_{\beta,\alpha}``G_\beta = G_\alpha \cap \mathrm{rg}(i_{\beta,\alpha})$.

If $\lambda = \kappa$, this implies (†1), since then for every $\epsilon \in [\eta, \xi]_\mathcal{T}$ we have $\lambda_\epsilon = \kappa_\epsilon$, and therefore either $G_\epsilon = \emptyset$ or $G_\epsilon = \{\kappa_\epsilon\}$.

So assume $\lambda < \kappa$. Let $\gamma \in G_\alpha$; so $\gamma \in [\lambda_\alpha, \kappa_\alpha]$. Let γ^* be least such that $i_{\beta,\alpha}(\gamma^*) \geq \gamma$; so $\gamma^* \in [\lambda_\beta, \kappa_\beta]$. If $i_{\beta,\alpha}(\gamma^*) = \gamma$ then ($*$5) implies that $\gamma^* \in G_\beta$. So assume $i_{\beta,\alpha}(\gamma^*) > \gamma$; therefore $\lambda_\beta < \gamma^* \leq \kappa_\beta$. As before, there is $f \in \mathcal{M}_\beta$ and $a \in \nu(E_\delta)^{<\omega}$ such that $f \colon \mu^{|a|} \to \gamma^*$ and $i_{\beta,\alpha}(f)(a) = \gamma$. By the hull property at γ^*, there is $g \in \mathcal{M}_\chi$ and $b \in (\gamma^*)^{<\omega}$ such that $f = i_{\chi,\beta}(g)(b) \cap (\gamma^*)^2$. But then $i_{\chi,\alpha}(g)(i_{\beta,\alpha}(b))(a) = \gamma$, and $(a \cup i_{\beta,\alpha}(b)) \subseteq \gamma$, so $\gamma \notin G_\alpha$, contradiction. This proves (†1).

Finally, suppose κ is afm in $\mathcal{M}_\xi$; we must see that $X = \{\kappa_\alpha\} \cup G_\alpha \backslash \sup i_{\eta,\alpha}``\kappa_\eta$ is a closed set of inaccessibles of $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$. We have κ_α afm, and so inaccessible, in $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$. If $\lambda = \kappa$ then $X = \{\kappa_\alpha\}$, so assume $\lambda < \kappa$. Then $i_{\beta,\alpha}$ is continuous at each $\gamma \in X' = \{\kappa_\beta\} \cup G_\beta \backslash \sup i_{\eta,\beta}``\kappa_\eta$ (since by $(1)_\beta$ every $\gamma \in X'$ is inaccessible in $\mathcal{M}_\beta$ and $\mu \leq \lambda_\beta < \gamma < \rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\beta}$), and $X = i_{\beta,\alpha}``X'$, so X is closed. This completes the proof of $(1)_\alpha$ in this subcase.

Subcase 2. *$\mu > \lambda_\beta$.*

By the case and subcase hypotheses, $\mu = \kappa_\beta > \lambda_\beta$.

We claim that (†2) $G_\alpha = (i_{\beta,\alpha}``G_\beta) \cup \{\kappa_\beta\}$; therefore $G_\alpha = (G_\beta \cap \kappa_\beta) \cup \{\kappa_\beta\} \cup Y$, where $Y = \{i_{\beta,\alpha}(\kappa_\beta)\}$ if $\kappa_\beta \in G_\beta$, and $Y = \emptyset$ otherwise. Combined with $(1)_\beta$, this readily gives $(1)_\alpha$ in this subcase.

As before, since $\lambda_\beta < \kappa_\beta$ we have that E_δ is type 1. Therefore κ_β is the only $i_{\beta,\alpha}$-generator, and (†2) then follows from the hull property for $i_{\chi,\beta}$ at κ_β, like in the previous subcase.

This completes this subcase, Case 2 and the successor step of the induction.

We mostly leave the case that α is a limit ordinal to the reader. However, let us observe why $\{\kappa_\alpha\} \cup G_\alpha \backslash \sup i_{\eta,\alpha}``\kappa_\eta$ is closed. Fix $\gamma < \kappa_\alpha$, and let $X = G_\alpha \cap (\gamma + 1)$ and $Y = X \backslash \sup i_{\eta,\alpha}``\kappa_\eta$. It suffices to see that Y is closed. Note that ($*$5) gives (†3) for any limit $\beta \in (\chi, \xi]_\mathcal{T}$, we have $G_\beta = \bigcup_{\beta' \in [\chi,\beta)_\mathcal{T}} i_{\beta',\beta}\text{``}G_{\beta'}$. Let $\alpha' \in [\eta,\alpha)_\mathcal{T}$ and $\gamma' < \kappa_{\alpha'}$ be such that $i_{\alpha',\alpha}(\gamma') = \gamma$. Then by (†3) and $(1)_\beta$ for all $\beta \in [\alpha',\alpha)_\mathcal{T}$, we have $X = i_{\alpha',\alpha}\text{``}X'$ where $X' = G_{\alpha'} \cap (\gamma'+1)$. Let $Y' = X' \backslash \sup i_{\eta,\alpha'}\text{``}\kappa_\eta$. Then $Y = i_{\alpha',\alpha}\text{``}Y'$, Y' is a closed set of non-afm inaccessibles of $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha'}$ and $Y' \subseteq \rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_{\alpha'}}$, so $i_{\alpha',\alpha}$ is continuous at each point of Y', so Y is closed.

Now suppose that $\kappa = \rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\xi}$.

If $\lambda = \kappa$, then $\lambda_\alpha = \kappa_\alpha = \rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha}$ for all $\alpha \in [\eta,\xi]_\mathcal{T}$, and G_α is at most $\{\kappa_\alpha\}$.[1] By $(*5)$ we therefore have $i_{\eta,\alpha}\text{``}G_\eta = G_\alpha$. The rest is trivial in this case.

Suppose $\lambda < \kappa$. Again $(*5)$ gives $(2)_\alpha(\mathrm{a})$. We have $\lambda \in \mathrm{rg}(i_{\chi,\xi})$ by Claim 1. For each $\alpha \in [\chi,\xi)_\mathcal{T}$, we have $\mathrm{crit}(i_{\alpha,\xi}) < \rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha}$ since there are no drops in degree in $(\chi,\xi]_\mathcal{T}$. Now an induction like in the previous case, but simpler, shows that $(2)_\alpha(\mathrm{b})$ holds for all $\alpha \in [\chi,\xi]_\mathcal{T}$. □

We now proceed to the proof of 2.7. For expository reasons, we first prove this and our main theorems with the assumption "$\mathsf{AD} + V = L(\mathbb{R})$" replaced by "$L(\mathbb{R}) \subsetneq V$ and $\mathcal{M}_\omega^\#$ exists and is iterable in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}))}$". This implies $\mathsf{AD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$, but is stronger; see [6] for the proof of this and the analysis of $\mathrm{HOD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$ under this assumption. We later explain how to avoid the extra assumption.

Proof of Lemma 2.7 using $M_\omega^\#$. We recall a few facts from the analysis of $\mathrm{HOD}^L(\mathbb{R})$. There is a directed system $\mathcal{F}$ defined in $L(\mathbb{R})$, consisting of premice and iteration maps, whose direct limit is $\mathrm{HOD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}|\Theta$. Let Σ be the unique iteration stragey for $M_\omega^\#$ in V; this agrees with the strategy Σ' in $V[G]$. In $V[G]$ there is a stack $\langle \mathcal{T}_i \rangle_{i<\omega}$ of normal iteration trees (that is, each $\mathcal{T}_i$ has a last model $\mathcal{Q}_{i+1}$, which is also the first model of $\mathcal{T}_{i+1}$), such that:

- $\mathcal{T}_0$ on $\mathcal{Q}_0 = M_\omega^\#$.
- For each $i < \omega$, $\mathcal{T}_i \in \mathrm{HC}^V$.
- The stack is via Σ' (equivalently, each $\mathcal{T}_i$ is via Σ).
- Let $\mathcal{Q}_\omega$ be the direct limit of the $\mathcal{Q}_i$'s under the iteration maps. Let δ_0^N denote the least Woodin cardinal of a model N. Then $\mathrm{HOD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}|\Theta = \mathcal{Q}_\omega|\delta_0^{\mathcal{Q}_\omega}$.
- Let $i < \omega$. Let $j_i : \mathcal{Q}_i \to \mathcal{Q}_\omega$ be the Σ'-iteration map. Let $\gamma < \delta_0^{\mathcal{Q}_i}$. Then $j_i \upharpoonright (\mathcal{Q}_i|\gamma) \in L(\mathbb{R})$.

Now let $\kappa < \Theta$ be a cardinal of $L(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\omega_1 < \kappa$. Work in $\mathrm{HOD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$. Assume that the ordertype of the set of measurables below κ is $< \kappa$. Note then that the measurable limits of measurables $\leq \kappa$ are bounded by some $\theta < \kappa$. Let X be the set of measurables in the interval (θ, κ). If X is bounded above by some $\gamma < \kappa$, let $\mu = 1$ and $\kappa_0 = \kappa$. Otherwise let $\langle \kappa_\alpha \rangle_{\alpha < \mu}$ enumerate X, in strictly increasing order. By choice of θ, this sequence is discontinuous everywhere. In either case, our assumptions give $\mu < \kappa$, and in fact by increasing θ if need be, we will assume $\mu < \theta < \kappa_0$.

---

[1] Although we have $\rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} \in \mathrm{Hull}_k^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha}(\mathrm{rg}(i_{\chi,\alpha}) \cup \rho_n^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha})$ when $k = n$, the same might not hold when $k = 0$. So $G_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ is possible.

Now in $V[G]$, fix $n < \omega$ such that $\theta, \kappa \in \mathrm{rg}(j_n)$.

For $\alpha < \mu$ let γ_α be the sup of all afm's γ of $\mathrm{HOD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$ such that $\gamma < \kappa_\alpha$. So $\gamma_0 \leq \theta$ and for $\alpha > 0$, $\gamma_\alpha = \sup_{\beta < \alpha} \kappa_\beta$. We have $\gamma_\alpha < \kappa_\alpha$ by choice of θ. Let G_α be the set of all j_n-generators in the interval $[\gamma_\alpha, \kappa_\alpha)$. Since $\kappa = \theta \cup \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} [\gamma_\alpha, \kappa_\alpha)$ then $\theta \cup \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} G_\alpha$ includes all generators for j_n below κ. Therefore

$$\mathrm{HOD}^{L(\mathbb{R})} | \kappa \subseteq \mathrm{Hull}_0^{\mathcal{M}_\infty}(\theta \cup \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} G_\alpha \cup j_n``\mathcal{Q}_n).$$

However, if $\gamma < \kappa$ is not a j_n-generator, by $(*5)$ there is $f : \bar{\kappa}^{<\omega} \to \bar{\kappa}$ and $a \in \gamma^{<\omega}$ such that $\gamma = j_n(f)(a)$. Therefore

$$\mathrm{HOD}^{L(\mathbb{R})} | \kappa \subseteq \mathrm{Hull}_0^{\mathcal{M}_\infty | (\kappa^+)^{\mathcal{M}_\infty}}(\theta \cup \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} G_\alpha \cup j_n``(\mathcal{Q}_n | (\bar{\kappa}^+)^{\mathcal{Q}_n})).$$

But $j_n \restriction (\bar{\kappa}^+)^{\mathcal{Q}_n} \in L(\mathbb{R})$, and this segment of j_n suffices to compute $\langle G_\alpha \rangle_{\alpha < \mu}$. Therefore $L(\mathbb{R})$ sees the previous fact. Moreover, we claim that each G_α has ordertype $\leq \omega_1$ (in fact, exactly ω_1). Therefore the previous fact gives a surjection $(\mathcal{Q}_n \times \theta \times \mu \times \omega_1)^{<\omega} \twoheadrightarrow \kappa$ in $L(\mathbb{R})$. Since $\mathcal{Q}_n$ is countable and $\theta, \mu, \omega_1 < \kappa$, this contradicts that κ is a cardinal in $L(\mathbb{R})$, completing the proof.

So fix $\alpha < \mu$. Fix $m \geq n$ such that $\alpha \in \mathrm{rg}(j_m)$ and let $i \geq m$. Let G^i_α be the set of $j_{n,i}$-generators in the interval $[\gamma^i_\alpha, \kappa^i_\alpha)$, where "superscript i" denotes preimage under j_i. We would like to apply Lemma 2.11 to deduce that $j_i``G^i_\alpha = G_\alpha \cap \sup j_i``\kappa^i_\alpha$. Given this, then $G_\alpha \cap \sup j_i``\kappa^i_\alpha$ has ordertype $< \omega_1$ (since $\mathcal{Q}_i \in \mathrm{HC}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$). But $G_\alpha = \bigcup_{i \geq m} j_i``G^i_\alpha$, by $(*5)$. So G_α has ordertype $\leq \omega_1$. (In fact G_α has ordertype ω_1, since enough normal iterates are absorbed by $\langle \mathcal{T}_i \rangle_{i < \omega}$.)

So we just need to see that Lemma 2.11 applies to the iteration $\langle \mathcal{T} \rangle_{i < \omega}$, with $\mathcal{M}_\chi = \mathcal{Q}_n$, $\mathcal{M}_\eta = \mathcal{Q}_m$ and the ordinal κ^m_α. We must see that $\mathcal{Q}_m$ has the hull property, relative to $j_{n,m}$, at every point in $[\gamma^m_\alpha, \kappa^m_\alpha]$. Trivially, $\mathcal{Q}_n$ has the hull property, relative to id, at every point in $I = [\gamma^n_0, \kappa^n]$. As in the proof of Lemma 2.11, an induction along on the branch b leading from $\mathcal{Q}_n$ to $\mathcal{Q}_m$ shows that for every $\beta \in b$, $\mathcal{M}_\beta$ has the hull property, relative to $i_{\mathcal{Q}_n, \beta}$, at every point in $i_{\mathcal{Q}_n, \beta}(I)$. This works because $\mathcal{Q}_n$ has no afm limits of afm's in I. Therefore $\mathcal{Q}_m$ has the hull property where required.

(Our use of Lemma 2.11 can be reduced to the restricted version described in Remark 2.10. For this version can be applied inductively to each $\mathcal{T}_i$ in turn, and $(*5)$ can be quoted when passing to the direct limit of the stack.) $\square$

We now proceed to some ZFC results which we will apply inside $\mathrm{HOD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$ in our proof of 2.1 and 2.2.

2.12. **Lemma.** (ZFC) *Let κ be either measurable or a limit of measurables. Then:*

(a) $\kappa \to [\mathrm{cof}(\kappa)]^{<\omega}_{<\kappa}$.
(b) *If* $\mathrm{cof}(\kappa)$ *is measurable then* $\kappa \to [\omega]^{<\omega}_{<\mathrm{cof}(\kappa)}$.
(c) *Assume either* $\mathrm{cof}(\kappa) = \omega$ *or* $\mathrm{cof}(\kappa)$ *is measurable. Let* $\lambda = \kappa$ *or* $\lambda = \mathrm{cof}(\kappa)$*, with* $\lambda \neq \omega$*. Let* $F : \kappa^{<\omega} \to \lambda$*. Then there is* $A \subseteq \kappa$ *of ordertype* κ *such that* $|\lambda \backslash F\text{“}A^{<\omega}| = \lambda$*, and if* $\lambda = \mathrm{cof}(\kappa)$*, then* $F\text{“}A^{<\omega}$ *is non-stationary in* λ*.*

Proof. First we prove (a) and (b); initially we work on both together. We may assume κ is singular as otherwise (a) is trivial and (b) just states that if κ is measurable then κ is Rowbottom. Fix $\lambda < \kappa$ and $F : \kappa^{<\omega} \to \lambda$.

Let $\mu = \mathrm{cof}(\kappa) < \kappa$. Fix a strictly increasing sequence $\langle \kappa_\alpha \rangle_{\alpha<\mu}$ of measurables $< \kappa$, whose supremum is κ, with $\mu, \lambda < \kappa_0$ and such that for each $\alpha < \mu$, $\gamma_\alpha < \kappa_\alpha$ where $\gamma_\alpha = \sup_{\beta<\alpha} \kappa_\beta$. Fix a normal measure U_α on each κ_α.

For $n < \omega$ let $T_n = {}^n(\omega \backslash \{0\})$. Let $a \in \mu^{<\omega}$ and $t \in T_{|a|}$. Fix a sequence $\langle X_{a,t,i} \rangle_{i<|a|}$ such that each $X_{a,t,i} \in U_{a_i}$ and $X_{a,t,i} \cap \gamma_{a_i} = \emptyset$, and such that F is constant over $X_{a,t} = \prod_{i<|a|} X^{t(i)}_{a,t,i}$. (For example suppose $|a| = 2$. Then $U' = U^{t(0)}_{a_0} \times U^{t(1)}_{a_1}$ is a κ_{a_0}-complete measure, so fix $X \in U'$ with F constant on X. For $u \in \kappa^{t(0)}_{a_0}$ let $X_u = \{v | (u, v) \in X\}$. Let X_0 be the set of all $u \in \kappa^{t(0)}_{a_0}$ such that $X_u \in U^{t(1)}_{a_1}$; so $X_0 \in U^{t(0)}_{a_0}$. Let $X_1 = \bigcap_{u \in X_0} X_u$; since $\kappa_{a_0} < \kappa_{a_1}$, $X_1 \in U^{t(1)}_{a_1}$. Let $X_{a,t,i} \in U_{a_i}$ be such that $X^{t(i)}_{a,t,i} \subseteq X_i$, for $i \in \{0, 1\}$.)

For each $\alpha < \mu$, let $X_\alpha = \bigcap I$ where I is the set of all $X = X_{a,t,i}$ such that $X \subseteq [\gamma_\alpha, \kappa_\alpha)$. There are at most μ such X, and $\mu < \kappa_\alpha$, so $X_\alpha \in U_\alpha$.

Now for (a), let $A = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mu} X_\alpha$. Then $|F\text{“}A^{<\omega}| \leq \mu$, as required. For if $b \in A^{<\omega}$ then there is a unique pair (a, t) such that $b \in X_{a,t}$, but F is constant over $X_{a,t}$, and there are only μ-many such pairs (a, t).

Now we prove (b), so assume $\lambda < \mathrm{cof}(\kappa)$. Let $G \colon \mu^{<\omega} \to \bigcup_n {}^{T_n}\lambda$, where for any $a \in \mu^{<\omega}$, $G(a) \in {}^{T_{|a|}}\lambda$ is such that $G(a)(t) = F(b)$ where

$b \in X_{a,t}$. Since $\lambda < \mu$, $\lambda^\omega < \mu$, so we can fix $X \in U$ such that for each $n < \omega$, G is constant over X^n. Let $A = \bigcup_{\alpha \in X} X_\alpha$. Then $|F``A^{<\omega}| \leq \omega$, since for $b \in A^{<\omega}$, the value of $F(b)$ depends only on the "type" t of b; that is, if $a_1, a_2 \in X^{<\omega}$ with $|a_1| = |a_2|$, $t \in {}^{T_{|a|}}\lambda$, $b_1 \in X_{a_1,t}$ and $b_2 \in X_{a_2,t}$, then $F(b_1) = F(b_2)$. But there are only ω-many such pairs $(|a|, t)$.

Now consider (c). We are given λ, F. Let $\mu = \mathrm{cof}(\kappa)$ and if $\mu < \kappa$, fix $\langle \gamma_\alpha, \kappa_\alpha, U_\alpha \rangle_{\alpha < \mu}$ as for parts (a),(b) above (with $\lambda < \kappa_0$ if $\lambda < \kappa$).

Case 1. $\mu = \lambda < \kappa$.

By the assumptions for (c) and case assumption, $\mu > \omega$ is measurable. Define sets $X_{a,t}$, for $a \in \mu^{<\omega}$ and $t \in T_{|a|}$, as before. Also define X_α, for $\alpha < \mu$, as before, and let U be a normal measure on μ. For each $n < \omega$ and $t \in T_n$, let $F_t : \mu^n \to \mu$ be defined $F_t(a) = F(b)$ where $b \in X_{a,t}$. Let $X_t \in U^n$ be such that for all $a, c \in X_t$ and $i < n$, $F_t(a) < a_i$ iff $F_t(c) < c_i$. In fact, take X_t such that if $F_t(a) < a_i$ for $a \in X_t$, then $F_t(a) = F_t(c)$ whenever $a, c \in X_t$ are such that $a \restriction i = c \restriction i$. Thus, we can fix $X \in U$, and a sequence of functions $\langle G_i^m \rangle_{m,i<\omega}$, where $G_i^m : \mu^m \to \mu$, and for all $a \in X^m$, $G_i^m(a) \geq \max(a)$, and such that for each n, t with $t \in T_n$, there are m, i, with $m \leq n$, such that for all $a \in X^n$, $F_t(a) = G_i^m(a \restriction m)$. (Note this includes countably many constant functions G_i^0.) Now define a club $C \subseteq \mu$, with strictly increasing enumeration $\langle \delta_\alpha \rangle_{\alpha < \mu}$, as follows. Let $\delta_0 < \mu$ be least such that $\delta_0 \notin \mathrm{rg}(G_i^0)$ for all $i < \omega$. Given δ_α, let $\delta_{\alpha+1}$ be the least δ which is closed under all functions G_i^m and $X \cap (\delta_\alpha, \delta) \neq \emptyset$. This determines C. Let $B = X \backslash C$. Note that B has ordertype μ and $G_i^m``B^{<\omega} \cap C = \emptyset$. Let $A = \bigcup_{\alpha \in B} X_\alpha$. Then $A$ has ordertype $\kappa$ and $F``A^{<\omega} \cap C = \emptyset$, so A suffices.

Case 2. $\mu = \lambda = \kappa$.

Suppose $\mu = \lambda = \kappa$. An argument like in Case 1, but simpler, and only using the measurability of κ, works.

Case 3. $\omega < \mu < \lambda = \kappa$.

Let $W : \kappa \to \mu$ be defined by $W(\beta) = \alpha$ where $\beta \in [\gamma_\alpha, \kappa_\alpha)$. Let $G = W \circ F$. By Case 1, there is $A \subseteq \kappa$ of ordertype κ and such that $G``A^{<\omega}$ is non-stationary in $\mu$. Then $|\kappa \backslash F``A^{<\omega}| = \kappa$.

Case 4. $\omega = \mu < \lambda = \kappa$.

We will argue similarly to Case 1. Let T be the set of functions $t \in {}^{<\omega}\omega$ such that if $n = \mathrm{lh}(t) \neq 0$ then $t(n-1) \neq 0$. Given $t \in T$, let U_t be the measure $\prod_{i<|t|} U_i^{t(i)}$. For each $t \in T$, fix $Y_t \in U_t$ such that there is $m < \omega$ such that $F``Y_t \subseteq \kappa_m$; let $m(t)$ denote the least such m. For each $i < \omega$, fix $Y_i \in U_i$, with $Y_i \subseteq [\kappa_{i-1}, \kappa_i)$ (where $\kappa_{-1} = 0$), and such that each $Y_t \subseteq \prod_{i<|t|} Y_i^{t(i)}$.

There are $\langle X_i \rangle_{i<\omega}$ and $\langle H_{m,s,i} \rangle_{m,i<\omega;\ s \in {}^{m+1}\omega}$ such that, with $X_s = \prod_{i<\mathrm{lh}(s)} X_i^{s(i)}$, we have

- each $X_i \in U_i$ and $X_i \subseteq Y_i$,
- $H_{m,s,i} : X_s \to [\kappa_{m-1}, \kappa_m)$, where $\kappa_{-1} = 0$,
- for all $u \in X_s$, $H_{m,s,i}(u) \geq \max(u)$,
- for each $t \in T$, there is (m, s, i) such that either
    - $s = t \restriction \mathrm{lh}(s)$ for some k, or
    - $s = t^\frown \langle 0, \ldots, 0 \rangle$, or
    - $s = (t \restriction (\mathrm{lh}(s) - 1))^\frown \langle j \rangle$ for some $j < t(\mathrm{lh}(s) - 1)$,

  and for all $u \in \prod_{i<|t|} X_i^{t(i)}$, $F(u) = H_{m,s,i}(u \restriction l)$, where $l = \sum_{i<\mathrm{lh}(s)} s(i)$.

This can be seen like in Case 1.

Now let $C_n \subseteq \kappa_n$ be the club of points $\gamma \in (\kappa_{n-1}, \kappa_n)$ such that for each $s : n + 1 \to \omega$ and $i < \omega$ we have $H_{n,s,i}``\gamma^{<\omega} \subseteq \gamma$. There are clubs $D_n \subseteq C_n$ and sets $A_n \subseteq \kappa_n$, each of ordertype $\kappa_n$, such that $A_n \subseteq X_n \backslash D_n$. Let $A = \bigcup_{n<\omega} A_n$ and $D = \bigcup_{n<\omega} D_n$. Then $A$ is as required, as $f``A^{<\omega} \cap D = \emptyset$ and $|A| = \kappa = |D|$. $\square$

We can now prove the main theorems, using $M_\omega^\#$. We only explicitly prove 2.1; an examination of its proof also yields 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.1 using $M_\omega^\#$. Work in $L(\mathbb{R})$.

Consider parts (b) and (d). Let $\kappa \geq \omega_1$ be a cardinal and let $F : \kappa^{<\omega} \to \lambda \leq \kappa$. Assume for the moment that if we're proving (d), then either $\lambda = \kappa$ or $\lambda = \mathrm{cof}(\kappa)$; for (b) there is no such restriction. Let $\mu = \mathrm{cof}(\kappa)$ and let $f : \mu \to \kappa$ be cofinal. Fix $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f, F \in \mathrm{HOD}_x$. We have $\mathrm{HOD}_x \models \mathsf{ZFC}+$"Either κ is measurable or is a limit of measurables, and if $\mu > \omega$ then μ is measurable", by Corollary 2.8 and [3, 8.25]. So Lemma 2.12 applies there, yielding a suitably homogeneous set $A \subseteq \kappa$. But then A works in $V = L(\mathbb{R})$ also.

For (d) in the remaining case that $\lambda \neq \kappa$ and $\lambda \neq \mathrm{cof}(\kappa)$, just apply (b). Part (b) also implies that if $\mathrm{cof}(\kappa) = \omega$ then κ is Rowbottom. Part (d), in the case that $\lambda = \kappa$, implies that κ is Jónsson. [2] $\square$

---

[2] Here is a slightly alternative argument for Jónssonness. Let $G\colon \kappa^{<\omega} \to \kappa$. We need a set $A \subseteq \kappa$ of ordertype κ such that $G``A^{<\omega} \neq \kappa$. If κ is regular then let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $G \in \mathrm{HOD}_x$ and use the fact that κ is measurable, and therefore Jónsson, in HOD_x. So assume $\mu = \mathrm{cof}(\kappa) < \kappa$. If $\mu > \omega_1$ then let $\lambda = \omega_1$ (then $\lambda < \mu$); if $\mu \leq \omega_1$ then let $\lambda = \omega_2$ (then $\lambda < \kappa$ since κ is singular). Let $F : \kappa^{<\omega} \to \lambda + 1$ be defined by $F(a) = \min(G(a), \lambda)$. By part (b), there is

We now reduce the hypotheses for the main theorems to $\mathsf{ZF} + \mathsf{AD} + V = L(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof of 2.1, 2.2, 2.7. The full argument is given in [5, §7]. We just introduce it here. Let ψ_0 be the conjunction of the first order statements we have proved to hold in $L(\mathbb{R})$ (in 2.1, 2.2 and 2.7). Assume that $L(\mathbb{R}) \models \neg\psi_0$. Then there is some $\gamma < (\delta^2_1)^{L(\mathbb{R})}$ such that $\mathcal{J}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}) \models \mathsf{ZF}^- +$"$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}))$ exists"$+\neg\psi_0$. Let γ be the least. Then [5, §7] shows that, using AD, there is a mouse M relating to $\mathcal{J}_\gamma(\mathbb{R})$ the way that $M^\#_\omega$ relates to $L(\mathbb{R})$. The arguments of this paper proving $L(\mathbb{R}) \models \psi_0$ (using $M^\#_\omega$) now show that $\mathcal{J}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}) \models \psi_0$ (using M), contradiction.[3] See [5] for the remaining details. $\square$

We remark that we don't need the full analysis of HOD above. It suffices to use the arguments of [5] analysing just $(\mathrm{HOD}|\Theta)^{\mathcal{J}_\gamma(\mathbb{R})}$ (where γ is as above). This simplifies the argument somewhat. Also, for proving 2.1 and 2.2 it suffices to analyse $(\mathrm{HOD}|\delta^2_1)^{\mathcal{J}_\gamma(\mathbb{R})}$, and for this, one can alternatively use the argument of [4] combined with a reflection argument like that in [5, §7]; details are given in [7].

References

[1] E. Kleinberg, *Infinitary combinatorics and the axiom of determinateness*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 612. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1977.

[2] W. Mitchell and J. R. Steel, *Fine Structure and Iteration Trees*, Lecture Notes in Logic, Volume 3, Springer-Verlag, 1994.

[3] J. R. Steel, *Outline of Inner Model Theory*, Handbook of set theory, eds. M. Foreman and A. Kanamori, Springer, 2010.

[4] J. R. Steel, $\mathrm{HOD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$ *is a core model below* Θ, Bulletin of Symbolic Logic, Volume 1, Number 1, 1995.

[5] J. R. Steel and W. H. Woodin, HOD *as a core model*, to appear in Cabal Seminar Vol. 3.

[6] J. R. Steel, *Woodin's analysis of* $\mathrm{HOD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$, unpublished notes, available at math.berkely.edu/∼steel.

$A \subseteq \kappa$ of ordertype κ such that if $\lambda = \omega_1$ then $|F``A^{<\omega}| \leq \omega$, and if $\lambda = \omega_2$ then $|F``A^{<\omega}| \leq \mu \leq \omega_1$. In either case, it follows that $G``A^{<\omega} \neq \kappa$, as required.

[3] One difference here is that [5, §7] only gives that M has an $(\omega, \omega_1, \omega_1)$-iteration strategy Σ in $V = L(\mathbb{R})$, but not that Σ extends to generic extensions $V[G]$. This wrinkle is dealt with in [5] by replacing $L(\mathbb{R})$ with $L(\bar{\mathbb{R}})$ with a certain countable set $\bar{\mathbb{R}}$. An alternative approach is to use absoluteness to show that, in fact, Σ suffices. For example: $\mathbb{R}$-genericity iterations of M, with each proper segment via Σ, produce wellfounded direct limits. For otherwise let T be the tree of attempts to produce a stack of non-dropping normal iteration trees $\langle \mathcal{T}_n \rangle_{n<\omega}$, with each $\mathcal{T}_n$ via Σ, and with illfounded direct limit. Then T is illfounded in $V[G]$, and so in V, contradiction.

[7] F. Schlutzenberg, $\mathrm{HOD}^{\mathcal{J}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})}$ *for* $\mathbb{R}$*-admissible* α *starting a gap*, unpublished notes, available from author's website